

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claim 4 is requested to be cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-3 and 5-20 are currently being amended. Support for the amendments to the independent claims can be found at least in original claim 4 and in FIGs. 3-6.

This amendment changes and deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-3 and 5-20 are now pending in this application.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103**

Claims 1-2, 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2005/0195242 to Kojima (hereafter “Kojima”). Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kojima in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,417,932 to Hirota (hereafter “Hirota”). Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kojima in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0212838 to Yamamoto (hereafter “Yamamoto”). Claims 5, 7-11, 13, 15 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kojima in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,204 to Suzuki et al. (hereafter “Suzuki”). Claims 6 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kojima in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0196471 to Hirai (hereafter “Hirai”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites “control means for effecting a control to allocate a memory capacity, which is usable in the memory means, to the individual processes at ratios determined for each process condition designated by the designation means”, where the “image process comprising individual processes of a color conversion process, a

discrimination process, a filter process and a tone process.” Thus, in the claim 1 apparatus, a usable memory capacity is allocated to individual processes of a color conversion process, a discrimination process, a filter process and a tone process, at ratios determined for each process condition designated. The references applied in the rejections of the claims fail to disclose at least this feature of claim 1.

Kojima discloses a data transfer system for transferring digital data, such as image data (abstract). Kojima discloses examples of such systems in FIGs. 1 and 8.

Nowhere, however, does Kojima suggest allocating a usable memory capacity to individual processes of a color conversion process, a discrimination process, a filter process and a tone process, at ratios determined for each process condition designated. Kojima fails to disclose an image process comprising individual processes of a color conversion process, a discrimination process, a filter process and a tone process, much less allocating a usable memory capacity to such individual processes at ratios determined for each process condition designated. Kojima fails to render claim 1 unpatentable for at least this reason.

The remaining references applied in the rejection of the claims were cited for other features of the claims, but fail to disclose allocating a usable memory capacity to the individual processes at ratios determined for each designated process condition, and thus fail to cure the deficiencies of Kojima.

Independent claim 14 recites “control means for effecting a control to allocate a memory capacity, which is usable in the memory means, to the individual processes at ratios determined for each process condition designated by the designation means or a determination result of the determination means” and “image process comprising individual processes of a color conversion process, a discrimination process, a filter process and a tone process”, and is thus patentable for reasons analogous to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Independent claim 16 recites “allocating a memory capacity, which is usable in the memory means, to the individual processes at ratios determined for each designated process

condition” and “image process comprising individual processes of a color conversion process, a discrimination process, a filter process and a tone process”, and is thus patentable for reasons analogous to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims, as well as for further patentable features recited therein.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 3, 2007

By Thomas S. Bilodeau

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 945-6162  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Pavan K. Agarwal  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 40,888

Thomas G. Bilodeau  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 43,438